

Intro To Nonscience

by
Axel Mundi

[Editor's note: this article was originally published in 1983.]

Recently, the *57th Periodic Conference on Nonscience* was held at the spacious, 27-room Hotel Biergarten in Lucerne, Switzerland. In view of the minimal--one might even say negligible--coverage of this important symposium by the press, it seems there is some need to acquaint the larger public with the basic background and precepts of *Nonscience*. This field is becoming more relevant and crucial with every passing year as its progenitor, Science, continues to threaten the very life of our planet, which it originally sought simply to understand. While it is doubtful that the readers of this esteemed periodical should not have been at least acquainted with the term "Nonscience", we shall attempt herein, for purposes of stimulating discussion, to present a simple and superficial introduction to the subject.

So then, what is Nonscience? To begin with, we might ask, what is Science? For, generally speaking, what Science is, Nonscience is not.

Science can be described as a system of knowledge based upon the twin concepts of *statistics* and *probability*, or in other terms, averages and norms. Science progresses by means of *hypothesis* and *experiment*, the results of which lead to the formulation of *laws*, or some would say, acceptable degrees of probability. Each new law becomes a building block on which to found the next theory which eventually, if not disproven, hardens into a law in its own right. These laws form (and continually add to) a gigantic frame of reference through which the real world is viewed and by which its processes are explained.

Because the so-called Laws of Science are really only the formulations of humans and are based on the limited assessment of available data, it has occurred several times through history that a single discovery (or invention) has virtually toppled the current framework or superstructure and caused the entire scientific world to regroup, building up a new temple of knowledge at which to worship. To those of us who view this approach to nature with a degree of skepticism, it appears that the world is moving dangerously near to another such breakthrough--or collapse--and what with the scope of Science's modern powers, this provokes in us more than a little alarm. It becomes ever clearer that the thinking people of our time need

an alternative against which to weigh the supposed wisdom of Science. That alternative is, logically, Nonscience, and it was the addressing of this urgent need which was the major thrust of the recent conference in Lucerne.

Nonscience rejects the notion of averages and norms as irrelevant, although many moderates in the field concede that those concepts were necessary steps to be taken along the road of knowledge. The liberals, on the other hand, regard Science as a disease which has to be treated. They see Nonscience as the treatment. Nonscience embraces the notions of chance and variability. To nonscientists, the future of the universe is unpredictable. A few examples:

Some scientists believe the universe will eventually collapse. A nonscientist will allow that they could be right. Many people believe that God is coming to take charge personally. Surprisingly to some, this too is possible in the view of Nonscience. And many other people hope life is just a bad dream with a happy ending. They, as the saying goes, are really reaching, but even this could prove to be the case. In fact, each of these views is equally as likely as the others to the nonscientist, for, to cite Benson's *57th Principle*: "All ideas are reflections of reality."

One problem which we of the nonscientific camp have with Science is that it has nowhere to begin. Science cannot explain where or how matter and energy originated. The Big Bang theory notwithstanding, there is no scientific explanation for nonexistence bringing forth its own opposite.

Gustav Benson, an obscure 18th century composer and professor of philosophy at the Vienna Boys Choir College, was the first to formally propose a radical new order. Professor Benson broke the intellectual ice in 1798, with the publication of his *Science As Absurdity*. Though only a small tract, which he distributed by hand around the scientific circles of Vienna, it had a powerful influence--though apparently only on Benson himself.

In it, he dared to suggest that nature, far from being the sum total of all matter and energy as Science sees it, is really more of a loose cannon, playing haphazardly in a universe of uncontrolled phenomena. Driven by his own impetus (for, in fact, no one else believed him), he developed his theory further in the paper, *God Came From Nowhere*, which he somehow managed to deliver at the prestigious Zurich Symposium of 1800. For his efforts, he was laughed out of the hall. Despite these less than sensational beginnings, Benson later would be known as the Father of Nonscience.

Benson's idea was that Science was misguided in its attempts to define the universe. Soon there were other voices sharing his concern. The Hungarian mystic, Bacco, writing in 1808, declared:

“Fences are fine, as long as you don't jump off them.”¹

John Hopkins, an itinerant preacher in America, observed at about the same time that Science was becoming, in his words, “as sloppy as religion.”²

Had Hopkins lived five or six centuries earlier, he might have been a prophet, instead of a simple preacher. There is evidence that the germ of modern Nonscience was planted as early as the late Middle Ages in Europe, but that the new and powerful magnetism of Science effectively absorbed what would have been a separate line of reasoning, and interpreted it to its own ends.

Beginning in the 14th century, there was an eruption of knowledge and research in the scientific world, as it then existed. This has been called both curious and profound; profound in its contrast to the dark times of the age just ending, and curious to those historians who are not aware of certain events, or choose to doubt the veracity of certain contemporary reports. For example, the private journals of several respectable citizens of a certain village in Germany--Ganzburg--report that during the winter of 1388 a spacecraft visited the earth, and made a stop at the home of Baron Klon von Zonn.

According to these reports, the Baron--an intellectual of mystical bent--claims to have engaged in lengthy but private communication with the unearthly visitors on topics which he did not reveal. It was observed that Baron von Zonn emanated great personal charisma after his meeting with the “ones from up there” (as he called the space travellers in his own diary.) This was so totally the opposite of his lifelong tendency to scientific and social reticence that his friends, and even his wife, described it as “a most astounding and convincing alteration”³ causing them to take “much seriousness out of what he said thereafter.”⁴

This is what he said, as he recorded it in his diary: “The world is but a kingdom of fools. Knowledge has been made king. But soon Science will be seen for what it really is. Then the world will be changed. It will be born again--”⁵

At the words “born again” (according to the Baron's frustrated diary entry), such a cheer went up among his friends and relatives that he was quite cut off and, losing his

¹ Fenster, H. P. (ed), *Words of Bacco (Definitive Edition)*, p. 39. Waller Press, Washington, 1957.

² Hopkins, John, *My Life, My Opinion*, p. 308.

Mathias Brown Publishers, St. Louis, 1823. (Out of print.)

³ Hochstater, H. P., *The Prophetic Baron: Klon von Zonn*, p. xii. Geld Publishers, Hamburg, 1962.

⁴ *ibid.*

⁵ von Zonn, *Diary of a Klon*, p. 494. Scribbler's, Boston, 1953.

train of thought, he never finished his statement. To his lifelong regret, the Baron's teachings were never fully expressed, and he died unknown to the general reading public.

His followers, however, took up the torch they supposed he had lit on behalf of Science and began to march forward with the fervor of religion burning in their minds. Yes, Science, that fledgling file system for facts, that infant toy of the human senses, had acquired faith--and thus the Modern World, the world of Science, was born. Those visitors from another solar system would probably have been shocked to see how the subtle seeds of Nonscience which they had planted in that little German village had mutated and spread through every laboratory and classroom in Europe.

Every country has its scientists, with their laboratories, where theories and experiments abound. Their ingenuity is truly amazing. Their adaptability is inspiring. Ironically, so is their complete variability. Yet, to paraphrase Pong-song Chin, the 20th Century Chinese diplomat-mathematician: *variability is the absurd side of nature*.

Indeed, says Nonscience, to claim that nature never varies would be absurd. Perhaps Science will eventually lead itself to the most shocking of all logical conclusions: that there is no norm in nature. In that case it might still be possible for Science to evolve into Nonscience quite painlessly. This seems highly improbable, though, given the current worldwide infatuation with statistics and probability.

Most laypeople see "normal" as the room temperature of reality. In other words, normal is that zone of cosmic contentment which nature is striving for. Most scientists accept the same premise, although clothed in technical terms. They seek to define the cosmos with the thermometer of norms. Theirs, however, is a system of statistics; and statistics, someone said, are the worst form of lies, whose effect is merely to divert the attention of trusting, albeit well-meaning, students and researchers.

How often through history has it occurred to the mind of a human that unpredictability might be the only eternal law of nature? Many times, one would think, considering the millions who have lived and the broad range of phenomena they have experienced. And yet, so unsettling is that notion, particularly to the sensibilities of religious leaders and, later, scientists, that few dared write it down or perhaps even say it out loud for many years.

One notable attempt to do so, predating von Zonn by many years, was made in Medieval Europe. In 829, a Swiss-Italian monk named Hanspucci (or Hans Pucci) introduced the idea of natural inconsistency into Christian Science (so to speak) with an illuminated scroll titled, simply, *God Said This To Me*. He received the words, it is said, in a vision during his meditation. Translated,

the text reads:

I walk not the same steps twice,
Sayeth the Lord.
My thoughts are like falling stars,
As lightning is my vision,
And the sinner catches not my eye again.⁶

His superiors at the monastery did not approve of Hanspucci's scroll. They told him to destroy it. Instead, he hid it under his straw mattress, where it stayed for ten years until the visionary monk was killed during a siege of the monastery by a group of Animists from Lucerne (always in the news it seems). They found the scroll and, for some reason, preserved it. It was taken back in 989 by Christian Crusaders, who put it into locked storage, where it was kept from harm until the present century.

Since its rediscovery in recent times, the so-called *Scroll of Hanspucci* has been seen as a proto-modern missing link by pragmatic Christian scholars--culminating, some say, in 1981 when Vladimir Gorny, that tightrope-walking Russian intellectual known affectionately as "the Communist Catholic", theorized that "God is a lonely individual whose thoughts are constantly turned inward."⁷ If this is not so, he speculated, then why is selfish individualism so strong a force in the world?

Although Nonscience is much indebted to the open-minded and sincere rationality of modern Christian intellectuals, it is undoubtedly most closely paralleled by the teachings of Gollyism, a "religion" or philosophy said to have been founded in the first century A.D. by the followers of the mystic peasant, Golly of Nazareth.

Gollyism is best summarized by its primary tenet, the so-called "Secret of Eternal Doubt." This daring doctrine asserts that the Almighty has no plan for the universe and is in fact more interested in a good surprise than inspiring belief or dogma. In essence this is the very view which Nonscience takes of the world. As the great Gollyite preacher, Oval Rubber, has put it succinctly, "All who believe will be surprised."⁸

Nonscience is not interested in facts. Facts, in the view of Nonscience, represent the attempts by human intelligence to attach static significance to essentially fluid bits of reality. The

⁶ Gabriel, A., *The Weird Side of Christianity*, from ChristReview, March 1972, p. 131.
R. U. Goode Press, New York.

⁷ Taft, William H., *When Saints Collide*, p. 197.
Two Mormons From Italy Book Co., Salt Lake City, 1984.

⁸ Rubber, Oval, *The Surprise Of Your Life*, p. 204.
Surprise U. Press, Houston (Kansas), 1982.
(Reissued by Axel Mundi Press, Manette, 2014.)

bits themselves do not really exist. There is only one unbroken whole, for which the terms *category* and *law* are as meaningless as *end* is meaningless in the concept of eternity.

And though this brief discourse will not attempt to explain (to borrow a term from Science) the methodology of Nonscience, it is hoped that it will awaken sufficient interest in the reader to inspire further investigation, not only of the more scholarly texts available on the subject, but also of the various papers and lectures from the recent *Periodic Conference* which prompted the present article.